



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,840	08/31/2001	James Cooper	088305-0137	8557

7590 01/30/2006

William T. Ellis  
FOLEY & LARDNER  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/942,840

Applicant(s)

COOPER ET AL.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-13, 15-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 10/26/2005.

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 10/26/2005, Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 14, 19, 22 and 28 were amended. This action is made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the role" in Line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The Examiner is not sure whether or not the Applicant meant to change the claim dependency of claim 23.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (US 6571245) in view of Yoshida et al. (US 5767853).

In regards to claim 1, Huang teaches a computer implemented method of automatically generating and rendering a custom view including at least two viewlets from two different applications, the method comprising: associating a received activity sequence with the user (i.e. "The virtual desktop can be customized in accordance with the needs and preferences of the user." Column 14, Line 6); storing the activity sequence and associated user as a user context in a data store (i.e. "The user information is maintained in a data record that is stored in the file server." Column 2, Line 53); and rendering a custom view to the user based on the stored user context (i.e. "The virtual desktop can be customized in accordance with the needs and preferences of the user." Column 14, Line 6), wherein the custom view comprises an association between the at least two viewlets in the activity sequence (Figure 4, Element 142, all the viewlets are associated under the "Applications" window during the activity sequence (i.e. selecting which icons to display)).

Although Huang teaches viewlets, Huang does not specifically teach receiving a defined activity sequence from a user, wherein the activity sequence comprises at least two viewlets, from two applications, respectively, wherein a viewlet represents a coherent set of operations performed by an application, and wherein each application is an ordered set of a plurality of viewlets; and wherein the user context also stores a sequence of the viewlets in the activity sequence and other information that enable the viewlets together to perform a defined task. Yoshida teaches receiving a defined activity sequence from a user, wherein the activity sequence comprises at least two viewlets, from two applications, respectively (i.e. "Viewing the display, the computer user operates the input device 2 to designate a region of operations to be turned into a macro. The region 30 in FIG. 8 is specified by the user by means of the appropriate input device such as a mouse, the region consisting of the operations covering illustratively the word processor 12, chart-making program 13 and drawing program 14." Column 6, Line 5), wherein a viewlet represents a coherent set of operations performed by an application , and wherein each application is an ordered set of a plurality of viewlets (i.e. "In FIG. 8, program functions are represented by blocks and results acquired by these functions are indicated in characters. From the display of FIG. 8, the following sequence of operations can be understood: the database programs 15 and 16 first prepare the data 17 and 18; the chart-making program 13 then prepares the table 19 based on the data 17 and 18; the drawing program 14 next draws up the drawing 20; and the word processor 12 prepares the document 21 using the table 19 and drawing 20, the prepared document 21 being delivered to the print-out

program 11 for print-out.” Column 5, Line 55); and wherein the user context also stores a sequence of the viewlets in the activity sequence and other information that enable the viewlets together to perform a defined task (i.e. “FIG. 9 is a view of a typical macro created automatically as per the procedure described above. The macro of this example involves starting the chart-making program 13, drawing program 14, and word processor 15 in that order.” Column 6, Line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Huang with the teachings of Yoshida and include a method which allows the user to specify the sequence of viewlets to perform a task with the motivation to provide the users with no specialized knowledge of computers to create macros with ease (Column 6, Line 35).

In regards to claim 2, Huang and Yoshida teach all the limitations of claim 1. Huang further teaches a computer implemented method, wherein the step of receiving the activity sequence includes: providing the user with a selection of available applications (i.e. “the virtual desktop can include objects associated with word processing, spreadsheet, e-mail, and other applications.” Column 14, Line 30); receiving user selections of applications (i.e. “The user can create, arrange, or delete objects within the desktop as necessary.” Column 14, Line 27); providing the user with a list of viewlets for each of the applications selected by the user (i.e. “Window 1130 includes, for example, an icon listing 1132, an item description listing 1134, and a query box 1136.” Column 14, Line 40); and receiving the user selection of viewlets corresponding to the user's selection of applications (i.e. “The user selects an icon to be associated

with the selected object. Subsequently, the user is able to activate the object (i.e., launch an application) by clicking on the icon.” Column 14, Line 45).

In regards to claim 6, Huang and Yoshida teach all the limitations of claim 1. Huang further teaches a computer implemented method according wherein the step of storing the activity sequence as a user context includes storing information related to the user's login to the two applications (i.e. “The first level of security is provided by the use of a secured login process. During the login process, a login window 1210 appears on the web page of the URL site server. Login window 1210 includes fields for the user identification and the user password. The login information is entered by the user and transmitted to the site server where it is compared with the information in a login database.” Column 14, Line 66 – Column 15, Line 5).

In regards to claim 7, Huang and Yoshida teach all the limitations of claim 1. Huang further teaches a computer implemented method wherein the information related to the user's login to the two applications comprises an access control list (i.e. “The first level of security is provided by the use of a secured login process. During the login process, a login window 1210 appears on the web page of the URL site server. Login window 1210 includes fields for the user identification and the user password. The login information is entered by the user and transmitted to the site server where it is compared with the information in a login database.” Column 14, Line 66 – Column 15, Line 5).

In regards to claim 8, Huang and Yoshida teach all the limitations of claim 1. Huang further teaches a computer implemented method, wherein the step of rendering

a custom view includes: retrieving the user context for the user (i.e. "A site server initially receives a URL access from a user at a local system. After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system." Column 2, Line 25); extracting viewlets from applications based on user context (i.e. "The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user and files accessible by the user. The web page can also include links to personal information of the user." Column 2, Line 30); and generating the custom view using the extracted viewlets and a device context corresponding to the device used for rendering to the user (i.e. "The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user and files accessible by the user. The web page can also include links to personal information of the user." Column 2, Line 30).

In regards to claim 9, Huang and Yoshida teach all the limitations of claim 1. Huang further teaches a computer implemented method, wherein the step of rendering a custom view further includes: retrieving the user context for the user (i.e. "A site server initially receives a URL access from a user at a local system. After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system." Column 2, Line 25); logging into the two applications based on information related to the user's login to the two applications stored with the user context (i.e. "A site server initially receives a URL access from a user at a local system. After a successful login, a personal web page of the user is retrieved from a file server and returned to the local system." Column 2, Line 25); upon successful logging in, extracting viewlets from



the applications based on retrieved user context (i.e. "The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user and files accessible by the user. The web page can also include links to personal information of the user." Column 2, Line 30); and generating the custom view for rendering using the extracted viewlets and a device context corresponding to the device used for rendering to the user (i.e. "The web page represents the virtual desktop of the user and includes links for applications available to the user and files accessible by the user. The web page can also include links to personal information of the user." Column 2, Line 30).

Claim 10 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is in the same context as claim 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 27 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 3, 12, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (US 6571245) in view of Yoshida et al. (US 5767853) further in view of Magallanes et al. (US 5925103).

In regards to claim 3, Huang and Yoshida teach all the limitations of claim 2. Huang further teaches validating user selection of viewlets (i.e. "The user selects an icon to be associated with the selected object. Subsequently, the user is able to activate the object (i.e., launch an application) [and hence validate it] by clicking on the

icon." Column 14, Line 45). Huang and Yoshida do not teach a method wherein the step of receiving the activity sequence includes providing suggestions to the user based on the applications selected by the user. Magallanes teaches "The internet access server can keep track both for accounting purposes the games "rented" by downloading but also can keep track of the games for the purposes of target marketing of new or improved games by providing a suggestion of new or updated games for the user to play." Column 12, Line 29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Huang and Yoshida with the teachings of Magallanes and include a method for providing suggestions with the motivation to give the user choices in order to make the decision easier for the user.

Claim 12 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 23, Huang and Yoshida teaches all the limitations of claim 19. They does not teach a computer implemented method wherein the step of receiving the defined activity sequence for a user includes providing suggestions to the user based on a role associated with the user. Magallanes teaches "The internet access server can keep track both for accounting purposes the games "rented" by downloading but also can keep track of the games for the purposes of target marketing of new or improved games by providing a suggestion of new or updated games for the user to play." Column 12, Line 29). By keeping track of the games, Magallanes creates a profile [i.e.

Art Unit: 2174

role] of the user and is therefore able to send suggestions based on this profile. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Huang and Yoshida with the teachings of Magallanes and include a method for providing suggestions with the motivation to give the user choices in order to make the decision easier for the user.

Claims 4, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (US 6571245) in view of Yoshida et al. (US 5767853) further in view of Sadhwani-Tully (US 6785822).

In regards to claim 4, Huang and Yoshida teach all the limitations of claim 1. They does not teach the computer implemented method, wherein the step of receiving the defined activity sequence for a user includes defining the activity sequence based on a role associated with the user wherein the role associated with a user specifies membership in a group of users that perform similar functions. Sadhwani-Tully teaches, "the user's group profile may be accessed for the action groups and system actions that provide functionality for the application." Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Huang and Yoshida with the teachings of Sadhwani-Tully and include a method to define the activity sequence based on the user's profile wherein the role associated with a user specifies membership in a group of users that perform similar functions with the motivation to give the user a more appropriate layout.

Claim 13 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 5 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art does not teach a method wherein receiving the defined activity sequence for a user includes providing suggestions to the user based on the role associated with the user; in combination with all of the other claim limitations.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BP

  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100